

stitution for it, and I believe that if you vote to keep section 1.17 in the constitution, you may very well jeopardize the constitution. It is for that reason, Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen, that I believe we should accept the original compromise of the Committee. The compromise was that there would be no pro-management planning and no pro-labor planning. This was the compromise.

I did not favor it, but I believe feelings and emotion have grown to the point in this State where the original compromise should be retained. For that reason, I believe that we should strike section 1.17 from the constitution.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of it?

Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: Mr. Chairman, as one of the principal proponents of the language of section 1.17 and also as someone who supported the amending language because it appeared to satisfy the storm and cry that has been raised since the passage of it, I feel it incumbent upon me to rise now in answer to what Delegate Hardwicke has said. Whatever way this vote goes, we are not going to find a solution that satisfies the constitution or satisfies the voters who have been very disappointed by the action of this Convention. Please remember that only thirty-seven of those delegates here in this room today originally voted against putting this proposal in the Constitution. Eighty-three of us voted for it, an overwhelming majority of this group, after five and a half hours of debate, after a presentation made without pressure, made on the issues, and as Delegate Hardwicke admits, the decision was a moral one. It was made by the majority of this group because it was believed by them to be right, proper, and correct.

What has happened to that majority, that we are deadlocked here today? I say that nothing has happened to that majority that would justify us as delegates to this Constitutional Convention to change our minds on the issue. We are here to decide what should go into the constitution, and to do it on the basis of our conscience, and to let that be our guide, and that only. We did once, and in the intervening few weeks we have been barraged by the kind of re-creation that employers visit upon employees who try to organize. I think the analogy is very apt.

All kinds of pressures have been brought to bear. All kinds of things have been said

that are inaccurate. The hue and cry has been made that there will be strikes. The answer is simple: there will not be strikes. There will not be any more or less, perhaps less. The hue and cry has been raised that it does not belong in the constitution. That question was fully debated and considered.

THE PRESIDENT: You have one-half minute, Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: I say to you that if this decision which was made fairly and in good faith only two and a half weeks ago is reversed by this group, the good faith of the voters of this State, many of whom are working people, many of whom count on this constitution having real meaning to them, will not be able to support the document, not only because of their disappointment in what we exclude, but because in their disappointment in the kind of people we are to be susceptible to this kind of pressure.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition to the question?

Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: Mr. President, I had hoped to maintain complete silence during this long afternoon. I really wonder if we are not getting the thing a little out of perspective. The effect of leaving this in the constitution, I think, will antagonize and raise the fears of a great many people throughout the State, probably unnecessarily, because, after all, the matter is left ultimately to the legislature to decide how far they will go to implement this provision. In the other hand, if the provision is deleted, the legislature has plenary power to deal with these things and to make all the necessary exceptions in favor of public employees or people who are engaged in businesses that are charged with the public interest. It seemed to me, to my way of thinking, that the safest thing to do was to leave this provision out; in short, to leave it to the legislature where, indeed, this ultimately leaves it if you put the thing in. I say, is the game worth the candle? Why not just leave it out instead of putting a novel and new thing into the constitution?

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of this section?

Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, when you say in favor of retaining the section—